

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/090,727

Applicant(s)

WEIGAND ET AL.

Examiner

Stephan F. Willett

Art Unit

2142

## All Participants:

(1) Stephan F. Willett.

(2) Tom Rozylowicz.

## Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 27 September 2006

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*1*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 1/19, I inquired into the sources of the first and second streams, and the representative agreed the claim could be clearer and he said he would change the claim. On 3/28, I inquired into the different portions of the data units and the representative further explained what was meant by attribute portion. On 9/27, I raised a concern about the antecedent basis of unicast address. The representative said he would email me a correction. On 10/3, the representative agreed to amend the specification as enclosed to clarify that the content was being sent to two or more terminals as he intended by the claim language.